

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/076,409

Applicant(s)

Walker et al

Examiner

James Myhre

Group Art Unit

2162



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James Myhre

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Dean Alderucci

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Mar 21, 2001

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-59

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Examiner noted that the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 was being withdrawn, but that the method claims did not appear to have any connection to the technological arts and would be rejected under the same paragraph for that reason. The Examiner also noted that there were two inventions in the claims: an electronic commerce invention which offered upsells to the customer, and an electronic couponing system which issued targeted coupons to customers. The examiner also noted that the first invention was already covered in one or more applications by the Applicant and recommended there claims be canceled from this application. After further discussion, Applicant Representative agreed to allow an Examiner's Amendment canceling claims 1-12, 48, and 54, but declined to allow the remaining method claims to be amended to include a reference to a computer or electronic system. The Examiner agreed to do an Examiner's Amendment canceling those claims in order to preclude including a restriction in the next Office Action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.